

# HIGHER EDUCATION UPDATE

NUMBER UP/01-3  
APRIL 2001



## *News from the* **CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION**

Alan Arkatov, *Chair*  
Carol Chandler, *Vice Chair*  
John G. Davies  
Phillip J. Forhan  
Susan Hammer  
Robert A. Hanff  
Lance Izumi  
Kyo "Paul" Jhin  
Ralph R. Pesqueira  
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.  
Evonne Schulze  
Olivia K. Singh  
Khyl Smeby  
Howard Welinsky  
Melinda G. Wilson

Warren H. Fox  
*Executive Director*

1303 J Street, Suite 500  
Sacramento, California 95814-2938  
Telephone (916) 445-7933 (Voice)  
FAX Number (916) 327-4417

---

## *Faculty Salaries at California's Public Universities, 2001-02*

---

ANNUALLY, in accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 of the 1965 General Legislative Session, the California State University (CSU) and the University of California (UC) submit to the California Postsecondary Education Commission information on faculty salaries for their respective institutions and for a set of comparison colleges and universities located primarily outside of California.

On this basis, Commission staff develops estimates of the percentage changes in faculty salaries in California public universities that will enable them to attain parity with their respective comparison groups in the forthcoming fiscal year. Current procedures dictate that initial parity figures for both systems, which are normally based on incomplete data from the comparison institutions, be reported to the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst each December. A preliminary report is submitted at the outset of the new year at the Commission's February meeting. A more complete report is brought before the Commission for adoption in April.

This document represents the final report on faculty salary compensation for the current (2000-01) and budget (2001-02) years. It also contains a brief description of the methodology employed to calculate the parity percentages, and the faculty salary increase trends over the past 20 years. Supplemental Budget Language adopted by the Legislature in 1998 precludes changes in the methodology prior to the 2002-03 budget cycle. In effect, because of the lengthy lead times required to develop the Governor's Budget, this means that if any changes in the methodology are contemplated for the 2002-03 cycle, discussions among the members of the Commission's Faculty Salary Advisory Committee should begin in the spring or summer of 2001.

---

### **A summary of the methodology**

The faculty salary methodology includes two separate comparison institution groups – one each for the CSU and the University of California. The procedures by which the systems collect data, and the techniques used to analyze those data, have been designed and refined periodically by the Commission – and the Coordinating Council before it – in consultation with the Commission's Faculty Salary Advisory Committee. The Committee includes representatives from the California State University, UC, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst, with the California Faculty Association included on the Committee as an observer. As a result, the faculty salary methodology is reflective of several compromises among interested parties rather than the vision of any single individual or agency.

This year's methodology is unchanged from the last several years, and can be found in considerable detail in several previous Commission reports. These include the June 1987 report *Faculty Salary Revisions* (CPEC 87-27), the June 1989 report *Revisions to the Commission's Faculty Salary Method-*

ology (CPEC 89-22), and the 1997 faculty salary report (CPEC 97-2), which includes the 1996-97 adjustments (there have been no revisions since that cycle).

The methodology consists of two primary elements: (1) collecting salary data from the comparison institutions; and (2) a computational process that involves the weighting of several data elements by various factors, such as the number of faculty at each rank.

Display 1 below shows the comparison institutions for the two university systems. Each is a list formulated through extensive discussions and compromises by the members of the Commission's Faculty Salary Advisory Committee. In the more than 30 years that the survey has been conducted, each list has changed numerous times, most recently in 1993-94 when three institutions in the State University comparison group were replaced. The University of California list is unchanged since 1988, when Cornell and the University of Wisconsin, Madison were replaced by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the University of Virginia.

The computational process includes a determination of current average salaries, by rank, in both the California systems and the comparison institutions, with each rank's average projected forward one year based on the previous five-year growth rate. The projected 2001-02 average rank-by-rank salaries for the comparison institutions

are then compared to the current-year State University and University averages. These averages are then combined into an "All Ranks Average" for each comparison group and California system and compared for the current and budget years. Comparing the projected average for the comparison group next year with the current-year average for the California system produces the budget-year "parity figure."

---

## Faculty salary trends

Display 2 on the next page shows the Commission's salary computations for each of the two public university systems, plus the actual amounts granted, since the 1981-82 fiscal year.

During the first half of the 1980s, the salary lag between CSU and its comparison group was consistently smaller than the comparable lag for UC and its group. However, by the late 1980s, this situation had reversed. During California's severe economic recession between 1991-92 and 1994-95, few if any faculty salary increases were funded in State budgets. This worsened the compensation deficiency between faculty at California's public institutions and their comparison groups to create the largest compensation disparity since the inflationary era of the 1970s and early 1980s.

---

*DISPLAY 1 Faculty Salary Comparison Institutions for the California State University and the University of California*

### The California State University

#### *Northeast Region*

Bucknell University\*  
Rutgers, the State University of  
New Jersey, Newark  
State University of New York,  
Albany  
Tufts University\*  
University of Connecticut

#### *Southern Region*

Georgia State University  
George Mason University  
North Carolina State University  
University of Maryland,  
Baltimore County

#### *North Central Region*

Cleveland State University  
Illinois State University  
Loyola University, Chicago\*  
Wayne State University  
University of Wisconsin,  
Milwaukee

#### *Western Region*

Arizona State University  
Reed College\*  
University of Colorado, Denver  
University of Nevada, Reno  
University of Southern California\*  
University of Texas, Arlington

### University of California

Harvard University\*  
Massachusetts Institute  
of Technology\*  
Stanford University\*  
State University of New York,  
Buffalo  
University of Illinois, Urbana  
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor  
University of Virginia, Charlottesville  
Yale University\*

\* Independent Institution.

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

**DISPLAY 2** *Comparison of Faculty Salary Parity Figures, with Actual Percentage Increases Provided, 1981-82 Through 2001-02*

Year	The California State University		University of California	
	Parity Figure	Salary Increase	Parity Figure	Salary Increase
1981-82	0.5%	6.0%	5.8%	6.0%
1982-83	2.3	0.0	9.8	0.0
1983-84	9.2	6.0	18.5	7.0
1984-85	7.6	10.0	10.6	9.0
1985-86	N/A	10.5	6.5	9.5
1986-87	6.9	6.8	1.4	5.0
1987-88	6.9	6.9	2.0	5.6
1988-89	4.7	4.7	3.0	3.0
1989-90	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
1990-91	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8
1991-92	4.1	0.0	3.5	0.0
1992-93	6.0	0.0	6.7	0.0
1993-94	8.5	3.0	6.5	0.0
1994-95	6.8	0.0	12.6	3.0
1995-96	12.7	2.5	10.4	3.0
1996-97	9.6	4.0	10.3	5.0
1997-98	10.8	4.0	6.7	5.0
1998-99	11.2	5.7	4.6	4.5
1990-00	11.1	6.0	2.9	2.9
2000-01	8.9	5.9	3.0	3.0
2001-02	7.9	N/A	3.9	N/A

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission

Since 1993-94, as California completed the transition from recession to economic boom, faculty have again received more competitive percentage salary increases, with slightly larger increases accruing to faculty at the California State University. As a result of this trend, the parity figure has declined significantly during this period for faculty at both university systems. UC's parity gap last year was 3.0 percent and the currently projected lag is 3.9 percent for 2001-02. At the State University, whose faculty this year will receive a projected average salary increase of 5.9 percent, the lag has lessened from 8.9 percent last year, and a high of 12.7 percent in 1995-96, to a projection of 7.9 percent in the upcoming 2001-02 fiscal year.

It is important to understand the meaning of these "parity" numbers. Last year, when the Commission reported an estimated lag of 8.9 percent for CSU faculty, it did not mean that the State University's faculty were actually paid 8.9 percent less than their colleagues in comparable insti-

tutions. This figure was a projection of a possible future (2000-01) based on observed trends over a five-year period, with the assumption that State University salaries would not increase at all in the 2000-01 fiscal year. The current lag – discussed below for 2000-01 – can be quite different from the projected lag, and normally shows a lower percentage than anticipated for the budget year, with the potential of there being no lag at all.

## The parity figures for 2000-01

### California State University

Display 3 on the next page shows the parity calculations for CSU for the current (2000-01) and budget (2001-02) years.

The "parity figure" for the State University system for 2001-02 is 7.9 percent – the percentage by which average salaries in the State University would have to increase to equal the average salaries projected to be paid by the comparison institutions in 2001-02. It indicates that average salaries in the current year are about 3.9 percent below those currently paid by the comparison group. These calculations are based upon actual information received from all of the State University's 20 comparison institutions.

Displays 4 and 5 on the following pages show rank-by-rank and institution-by-institution salaries for both the State University and the comparison group in 1995-96 and 2000-01. These data are used to determine the five-year compounded average growth rate that permits current-year salaries to be projected into the budget year. The shaded lines in both displays indicate the State University's relative position overall to the entire list. It shows that CSU remains in 11th place, exactly at the median of its 20 comparison institutions.

For the current year, faculty at each individual rank (except for the few remaining instructors) all fall below the median, ranging from 14th to 19th place. However, the State University's overall average remains at the median because of the fact that CSU has nearly 55 percent of its faculty at the full professor rank, while the comparison institutions, as a group, have just over 37 percent at that rank.

### University of California

This report contains current-year data from all of the University of California's eight comparison institutions.

**DISPLAY 3** *California State University Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1995-96 and 2000-01; Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 2001-02; and Projected CSU Faculty Salary Percentage Increase Required to Attain Parity with the Comparison Group in 2001-02*

	Comparison Group Average Salaries	Comparison Group Average Salaries	Compound Rate of Increase	Comparison Group Projected Salaries	
<u>Academic Rank</u>	<u>1995-96<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>2000-01<sup>1</sup></u>		<u>2001-02</u>	
Professor	\$73,339	\$89,346	4.0%	\$92,945	
Associate Professor	\$53,943	\$64,712	3.7%	\$67,111	
Assistant Professor	\$44,400	\$53,209	3.7%	\$55,171	
Instructor	\$34,385	\$39,123	2.6%	\$40,146	
	California State University Actual Average Salaries	Comparison Group <u>Average Salaries</u>		Percentage Increase Required in California State University Average Salaries to Equal the Comparison <u>Institution Average</u>	
<u>Academic Rank</u>	<u>2000-01<sup>3</sup></u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>2000-01</u>	<u>Projected</u> <u>2001-02</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>2000-01</u>	<u>Projected</u> <u>2001-02</u>
Professor	\$80,302	\$89,346	\$92,945	11.3%	15.7%
Associate Professor	\$64,683	\$64,712	\$67,111	0.0%	3.8%
Assistant Professor	\$51,932	\$53,209	\$55,171	2.5%	6.2%
Instructor	\$40,206	\$39,123	\$40,146	-2.7%	-0.2%
Weighted by State University Staffing	\$69,067	\$74,267	\$77,155	7.5%	11.7%
Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing	\$66,291	\$69,960	\$72,640	5.5%	9.6%
<i>All Ranks Average and Net Percentage Amount<sup>2</sup></i>	\$68,373	\$71,037	\$73,769	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>7.9%</b>
<b>Institutional Current-Year</b>					
<b>Staffing Pattern</b>		<b>Associate</b>	<b>Assistant</b>		
<b><u>(Headcount Faculty)</u></b>	<b><u>Professor</u></b>	<b><u>Professor</u></b>	<b><u>Professor</u></b>	<b><u>Instructor</u></b>	<b><u>Total</u></b>
California State University	6,050	1,885	2,659	490	11,084
<i>Percent</i>	<i>54.6%</i>	<i>17.0%</i>	<i>24.0%</i>	<i>4.4%</i>	
Comparison Institutions	4,688	4,165	3,167	518	12,538
<i>Percent</i>	<i>37.4%</i>	<i>33.2%</i>	<i>25.3%</i>	<i>4.1%</i>	

1. Weighted 58% high-cost institutions, 42% low-cost institutions.

2. "All-Ranks Average" salaries are derived by weighting the State University and Comparison Institutions by 75 % of their own staffing pattern and 25% of the comparison institution's staffing pattern.

3. The salary estimates for the end of 2000-01 are projected as being 11.4% above Fall 1999 (not 2000) average salaries at each rank.

Source: CPEC staff analysis

DISPLAY 4 California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 1995-96

Institution	Professors			Associate Professors			Assistant Professors			Instructors			Weighted Ave.	
	No.	Average Salary (rank)		No.	Average Salary (rank)		No.	Average Salary (rank)		No.	Average Salary (rank)		Total	Salary (rank)
Institution J <sup>1</sup>	109	\$89,976	(1)	112	\$68,165	(1)	89	\$54,509	(1)	17	\$41,196	(5)	327	\$70,316 (1)
Institution Q <sup>1</sup>	472	82,806	(2)	349	59,783	(3)	260	50,625	(2)	38	45,361	(3)	1,119	66,877 (2)
Institution B <sup>1</sup>	486	80,558	(3)	346	60,851	(2)	230	47,556	(3)	6	46,669	(1)	1,068	66,876 (3)
Institution N	283	75,506	(7)	198	55,356	(5)	95	43,556	(9)	0	0	--	576	63,310 (4)
Institution P <sup>1</sup>	112	78,543	(5)	120	58,135	(4)	66	43,685	(8)	0	0	--	298	62,605 (5)
Institution R <sup>1</sup>	211	79,251	(4)	264	54,952	(6)	134	43,097	(13)	49	34,810	(7)	658	58,830 (6)
Institution K	483	70,834	(11)	341	51,080	(12)	233	44,072	(5)	17	33,742	(12)	1,074	58,169 (7)
Institution S <sup>1</sup>	288	71,132	(10)	270	54,850	(7)	200	44,836	(4)	19	41,812	(4)	777	57,989 (8)
Institution G <sup>1</sup>	152	76,137	(6)	213	54,406	(8)	142	43,349	(11)	3	34,200	(10)	510	57,685 (9)
Institution M <sup>1</sup>	144	70,696	(12)	127	51,988	(11)	86	41,661	(16)	2	45,895	(2)	359	56,984 (10)
<b>CSU</b>	<b>6,706</b>	<b>\$62,293</b>	<b>(19)</b>	<b>2,032</b>	<b>\$49,979</b>	<b>(14)</b>	<b>1,520</b>	<b>\$40,854</b>	<b>(17)</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>\$32,734</b>	<b>(14)</b>	<b>10,408</b>	<b>\$56,332 (11)</b>
Institution C	84	71,430	(9)	88	53,550	(9)	80	43,468	(10)	1	33,000	(13)	253	56,217 (12)
Institution F	235	74,311	(8)	250	52,101	(10)	235	43,128	(12)	34	34,106	(11)	754	55,415 (13)
Institution A	593	65,901	(14)	463	49,302	(16)	262	41,895	(15)	41	27,631	(18)	1,359	54,463 (14)
Institution T	277	63,909	(17)	314	50,938	(13)	150	43,958	(7)	5	34,526	(9)	746	54,241 (15)
Institution L	55	63,910	(16)	22	47,539	(19)	33	40,742	(18)	1	35,865	(6)	111	53,525 (16)
Institution I <sup>1</sup>	99	67,972	(13)	129	48,978	(18)	91	42,925	(14)	28	31,125	(15)	347	51,369 (17)
Institution D	146	62,499	(18)	198	49,266	(17)	113	40,432	(19)	17	30,976	(16)	474	50,580 (18)
Institution E <sup>1</sup>	104	65,334	(15)	114	49,612	(15)	107	43,990	(6)	49	34,807	(8)	374	50,436 (19)
Institution H	290	58,681	(21)	194	45,837	(20)	217	39,529	(20)	7	28,472	(17)	708	48,993 (20)
Institution O	211	62,038	(20)	213	44,839	(21)	147	37,326	(21)	44	25,492	(19)	615	47,560 (21)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4,834</b>	<b>\$71,969</b>		<b>4,325</b>	<b>\$53,224</b>		<b>2,970</b>	<b>\$43,938</b>		<b>378</b>	<b>\$34,208</b>		<b>12,507</b>	<b>\$57,689</b>
<b>High cost 10</b>	<b>2,177</b>	<b>\$77,779</b>		<b>2,044</b>	<b>\$56,757</b>		<b>1,405</b>	<b>\$46,213</b>		<b>211</b>	<b>\$37,799</b>		<b>5,837</b>	<b>\$61,374</b>
<b>Low cost 10</b>	<b>2,657</b>	<b>67,209</b>		<b>2,281</b>	<b>50,058</b>		<b>1,565</b>	<b>41,896</b>		<b>167</b>	<b>29,671</b>		<b>6,670</b>	<b>54,464</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,834</b>	<b>\$73,339</b>		<b>4,325</b>	<b>\$53,943</b>		<b>2,970</b>	<b>\$44,400</b>		<b>378</b>	<b>\$34,385</b>		<b>12,507</b>	<b>\$58,472</b>

1. Universities located in higher cost areas.

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor

DISPLAY 5 California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 2000-01

Institution	Professors			Associate Professors			Assistant Professors			Instructors			Weighted Ave.		
	No.	Average Salary (rank)		No.	Average Salary (rank)		No.	Average Salary (rank)		No.	Average Salary (rank)		Total	Average Salary (rank)	
Institution J <sup>1</sup>	136	\$109,511	(1)	119	\$81,330	(1)	93	\$62,664	(2)	35	\$44,292	(5)	383	\$83,420	(1)
Institution Q <sup>1</sup>	522	102,235	(2)	330	71,196	(3)	241	62,707	(1)	36	47,852	(2)	1,129	82,990	(2)
Institution B <sup>1</sup>	436	95,969	(5)	339	71,920	(2)	256	56,193	(3)	19	50,854	(1)	1,050	77,690	(3)
Institution P <sup>1</sup>	129	91,140	(6)	118	66,765	(5)	64	50,883	(13)	0	0	--	311	73,607	(4)
Institution K	481	91,366	(7)	350	66,378	(6)	250	56,092	(4)	17	41,963	(7)	1,098	74,604	(5)
Institution N	223	88,770	(8)	186	62,997	(10)	97	53,147	(6)	0	0	--	506	72,467	(6)
Institution R <sup>1</sup>	223	97,785	(4)	265	68,077	(4)	197	50,801	(10)	71	43,400	(6)	756	70,021	(7)
Institution M <sup>1</sup>	165	85,544	(9)	130	62,468	(11)	103	50,011	(14)	4	39,107	(14)	402	68,515	(8)
Institution A	603	83,994	(13)	414	60,831	(13)	277	52,284	(8)	48	37,455	(11)	1,342	68,639	(9)
Institution S <sup>1</sup>	268	85,970	(11)	250	66,056	(7)	198	51,685	(11)	32	45,663	(3)	748	68,514	(10)
<b>CSU</b>	<b>6,324</b>	<b>\$75,950</b>	<b>(19)</b>	<b>1,897</b>	<b>\$60,717</b>	<b>(14)</b>	<b>2,305</b>	<b>\$49,181</b>	<b>(17)</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>\$38,403</b>	<b>(8)</b>	<b>10,927</b>	<b>\$66,281</b>	<b>(11)</b>
Institution I <sup>1</sup>	120	86,199	(10)	122	61,100	(12)	119	52,307	(7)	25	37,763	(9)	386	64,681	(12)
Institution F	177	99,609	(3)	282	64,160	(8)	300	53,582	(5)	92	33,260	(16)	851	64,463	(13)
Institution G <sup>1</sup>	154	81,211	(14)	227	59,773	(16)	95	49,826	(15)	0	0	--	476	64,724	(14)
Institution C	70	84,521	(12)	103	63,875	(9)	109	51,667	(12)	2	45,605	(4)	284	64,150	(15)
Institution T	246	78,062	(15)	268	60,468	(15)	180	51,976	(9)	9	36,876	(12)	703	64,148	(16)
Institution O	211	77,164	(17)	170	56,328	(20)	110	49,430	(16)	5	34,972	(15)	496	63,447	(17)
Institution L	50	76,630	(18)	27	57,384	(18)	44	48,301	(19)	0	0	--	121	62,034	(18)
Institution D	155	71,578	(20)	184	56,350	(19)	109	45,473	(21)	6	37,490	(10)	454	58,688	(19)
Institution H	252	68,817	(21)	190	53,906	(21)	243	46,246	(20)	0	0	--	685	56,674	(20)
Institution E <sup>1</sup>	121	77,583	(16)	117	57,479	(17)	97	49,003	(18)	109	35,621	(13)	444	55,740	(21)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4,742</b>	<b>\$88,306</b>		<b>4,191</b>	<b>\$64,090</b>		<b>3,182</b>	<b>\$52,849</b>		<b>510</b>	<b>\$39,527</b>		<b>12,625</b>	<b>\$69,360</b>	
<b>High cost 10</b>	<b>2,274</b>	<b>\$93,693</b>		<b>2,017</b>	<b>\$67,355</b>		<b>1,463</b>	<b>\$54,467</b>		<b>331</b>	<b>\$41,586</b>		<b>6,085</b>	<b>\$74,961</b>	
<b>Low cost 10</b>	<b>2,468</b>	<b>83,343</b>		<b>2,174</b>	<b>61,061</b>		<b>1,719</b>	<b>51,472</b>		<b>179</b>	<b>35,721</b>		<b>6,540</b>	<b>64,149</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,742</b>	<b>\$89,346</b>		<b>4,191</b>	<b>\$64,712</b>		<b>3,182</b>	<b>\$53,209</b>		<b>510</b>	<b>\$39,123</b>		<b>12,625</b>	<b>\$70,420</b>	

1. Universities located in higher cost areas.

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor

Display 6 on the next page shows the parity calculations for UC for both the current and budget years. For the University system, the methodology indicates a “parity figure” of 3.9 percent, which indicates the percentage amount by which UC faculty will lag their counterparts if no salary increase is granted for 2001-02. The display also indicates that University average salaries are about equal to the comparison group – leading by only 0.4 percent – in the 2000-01 fiscal year.

Display 7 presents 1995-96 and 2000-01 comparison institution data, by rank, and indicates that UC has improved the relative strength of its median position over this five-year period. Five years ago, there was almost no difference between UC and the institution just below it; today the University’s average is \$10,724 higher than that institution. There is no change from last year in the public/independent relationship relative to faculty salaries – that is, each of the independent institutions pays more than any of the public institutions.

It may be noted that UC’s rank-by-rank position relative to its comparison institutions is more consistent than it is with the State University. For example, where in the current year the University’s all-ranks average is at the median – fifth of nine listed, including the University of California – of the comparison institutions listed, it is also fifth for full professors, fifth for associate professors, and fourth for assistant professors. By contrast, the State University’s all ranks average is 11th in the current year, but 19th for full professors, 14th for associate professors, and 17th for assistant professors.

The consistency of UC’s position occurs because the distribution of faculty at each professorial rank in that system is similar to the distribution of faculty in its eight comparison institutions. As noted above, that similarity is not as evident in the CSU distribution, since a higher percentage have been awarded full professor appointments.

**DISPLAY 6**     *University of California Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1995-96 and 2000-01; Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 2001-02; and Projected UC Faculty Salary Percentage Increase Required to Attain Parity with the Comparison Group in 2001-02*

<u>Academic Rank</u>	<u>Comparison Group Average Salaries</u>		<u>Compound Rate of Increase</u>	<u>Comparison Group Projected Salaries, 2001-02</u>	
	<u>1995-96<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>2000-01<sup>1</sup></u>			
Professor	\$89,318	\$110,275	4.3%	\$115,023	
Associate Professor	\$60,301	\$74,171	4.2%	\$77,307	
Assistant Professor	\$50,609	\$62,038	4.2%	\$64,617	
<u>Academic Rank</u>	<u>University of Calif. Average Salaries, 2000-01</u>	<u>Comparison Group Average Salaries</u>		<u>Percent Increase Required in University Ave. Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution Average</u>	
		<u>Actual 2000-01</u>	<u>Projected 2001-02</u>	<u>Actual 2000-01</u>	<u>Projected 2001-02</u>
Professor	\$107,612	\$110,275	\$115,023	2.5%	6.9%
Associate Professor	\$71,347	\$74,171	\$77,307	4.0%	8.4%
Assistant Professor	\$63,408	\$62,038	\$64,617	-2.2%	1.9%
Weighted by University of California Staffing	\$92,988	\$95,023	\$99,088	2.2%	6.6%
Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing	\$88,772	\$90,468	\$94,328	1.9%	6.3%
<b>All Ranks Average/Net Percentage Amount<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$91,934</b>	<b>\$91,607</b>	<b>\$95,518</b>	<b>-0.4%</b>	<b>3.9%</b>
<u>Institutional Budget-Year Staffing Pattern, (Full-Time-Equivalent Faculty)</u>		<u>Professor</u>	<u>Associate Professor</u>	<u>Assistant Professor</u>	<u>Total</u>
University of California		3,746.6	1,206.5	969.7	5,922.8
Percent		63.3%	20.4%	16.4%	100.0%
Comparison Institutions		4,339.4	1,760.1	2,014.2	8,113.7
Percent		53.5%	21.7%	24.8%	100.0%

1. Weighted 50% public comparison institutions, 50% independent comparison institutions. The University of California Office of the President reports that it has final survey results from seven of its eight comparison institutions and has estimated final results for the eighth institution.
2. All-Ranks Average derived by weighting University and Comparison Institutions by 75 percent of their own staffing pattern and 25 percent of the other's staffing pattern.

Source: CPEC staff analysis



DISPLAY 7 University of California Comparison Institution Average Salaries and Ranking, 1995-96 and 2000-01

<i><b>1995-96</b></i>	Type <sup>1</sup>	<u>Professor</u>			<u>Associate Professor</u>			<u>Assistant Professor</u>			<u>Total Faculty</u>		
		Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank
Institution H	I	580	\$108,081	1	132	\$62,734	4	181	\$57,103	1	893	\$91,046	1
Institution A	I	484	\$101,603	2	140	\$68,960	1	154	\$55,319	2	778	\$86,567	2
Institution F	I	581	\$97,341	3	156	\$67,226	2	178	\$53,863	4	915	\$83,749	3
Institution D	I	359	\$95,591	4	104	\$56,515	5	175	\$47,565	6	638	\$76,048	4
<b>Univ. of Calif.</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>3,190</b>	<b>\$82,621</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1,197</b>	<b>\$55,583</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>960</b>	<b>\$47,902</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5,347</b>	<b>\$70,335</b>	<b>5</b>
Institution E	P	692	\$81,721	6	336	\$63,833	3	351	\$54,076	3	1,379	\$70,326	6
Institution C	P	313	\$79,237	7	248	\$56,324	6	156	\$43,963	8	717	\$63,655	7
Institution G	P	871	\$74,378	9	491	\$53,187	8	378	\$45,895	7	1,740	\$62,214	8
Institution B	P	429	\$75,609	8	286	\$51,953	9	188	\$42,966	9	903	\$61,316	9
<b>Totals</b>		<b>4,309.2</b>	<b>\$89,318</b>		<b>1,892.8</b>	<b>\$60,301</b>		<b>1,760.4</b>	<b>\$50,609</b>		<b>7,962.4</b>	<b>\$74,774</b>	

  

<i><b>2000-01</b></i>	Type <sup>1</sup>	<u>Professor</u>			<u>Associate Professor</u>			<u>Assistant Professor</u>			<u>Total Faculty</u>		
		Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank
Institution H	I	641	\$130,480	1	111	\$79,979	2	233	\$70,453	2	985	\$110,590	1
Institution A	I	510	\$121,698	2	126	\$87,809	1	214	\$68,008	3	850	\$103,157	2
Institution F	I	553	\$117,647	3	180	\$78,750	3	169	\$72,280	1	902	\$101,385	3
Institution D	I	385	\$117,286	4	69	\$71,045	6	182	\$58,165	5	636	\$95,351	4
<b>Univ. of Calif.</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>3,747</b>	<b>\$107,612</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1,206</b>	<b>\$71,347</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>970</b>	<b>\$63,408</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5,923</b>	<b>\$92,988</b>	<b>5</b>
Institution B	P	453	\$101,666	6	261	\$70,045	7	220	\$56,902	7	934	\$82,264	6
Institution E	P	696	\$102,151	7	350	\$71,856	4	453	\$57,819	6	1,499	\$81,680	7
Institution G	P	803	\$93,936	9	458	\$65,566	8	347	\$56,281	8	1,608	\$77,731	8
Institution C	P	299	\$94,020	8	205	\$64,606	9	196	\$54,598	9	700	\$74,367	9
<b>Total</b>		<b>4,339.4</b>	<b>\$110,275</b>		<b>1,760.1</b>	<b>\$74,171</b>		<b>2,014.2</b>	<b>\$62,038</b>		<b>8,113.7</b>	<b>\$91,379</b>	

1. I =Independent; P = Public.  
2. Estimated data.

Source: University of California, Office of the President.